

Appl. No. 10/648,336  
Amendment dated: December 21, 2005  
Reply to OA of: August 23, 2005

### **REMARKS**

This is in response to the Official Action dated August 23, 2005. Applicants have amended the claims in order to more precisely define the scope of the invention taking into consideration the outstanding Official Action.

The Official Action urges that the Declaration does not comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.63(c) because neither the Declaration nor Application Data Sheet acknowledge the filing of any foreign priority application. Applicants specifically traverse this statement. The Application Data Sheet filed August 27, 2003, clearly acknowledges the filing of three Taiwan Patent Applications (91119461, 91119460 and 91119459) on page 5 of the Application Data Sheet. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the next Official Action recognize that the Declaration is in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.63(c) or more precisely explain how the Declaration is defective.

The Official Action urges that the title of the invention is not descriptive. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the title of the present invention and have adopted the language suggested by the Examiner in the outstanding Official Action. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the next Official Action recognize that the title of the present application is acceptable.

The Official Action objects to claim 6 because the Official Action believes that "of" should be replaced with "and" at line 3 of claim 6. Applicants have amended the claims to delete the phrase "said first electrode in", as this phrase was erroneously included in the claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 is now in proper idiomatic English and request that the objection to claim 6 be withdrawn.

Applicants have also taken this opportunity to correct an obvious typographical error in claim 1. In the last paragraph of claim 1, the term "electrodesdon't" has been replaced with the phrase "electrodes do not". Thus, this obvious typographical error in claim 1 has been remedied.

The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-13, 15-16, 18-20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinata in view of Endo and Lu has been carefully

Appl. No. 10/648,336  
Amendment dated: December 21, 2005  
Reply to OA of: August 23, 2005

considered but is most respectfully traversed in light of the amendments to the claims and the following comments.

Applicants wish to direct the Examiner's attention to the basic requirements of a prima facie case of obviousness as set forth in the MPEP § 2143. This section states that to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria first must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Section 2143.03 states that all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Applicants also most respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to MPEP § 2144.08 (page 2100-114) wherein it is stated that Office personnel should consider all rebuttal argument and evidence presented by applicant and the citation of *In re Soni* for error in not considering evidence presented in the specification.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 10, from which all other claims pending in the present application depend, the Official Action urges that Hinata discloses a substrate 2 having a first conducting area, a second conducting area, a third conducting area and an active area wherein the active area is located between the first conducting area and the second conducting area;

the third conducting area is located at one side of the active area;

Appl. No. 10/648,336  
Amendment dated: December 21, 2005  
Reply to OA of: August 23, 2005

the first conducting area, second conducting area, third conducting area and active area are integrated together on the surface of substrate 2;

the third conducting area is located adjacent to the first conducting area, second conducting area and active area;

a plurality of first conducting lines 14 located in the first conducting area;

a plurality of second conducting lines 14 located in the second conducting area;

a plurality of third conducting lines 15 located in the third conducting area;

a plurality of first electrodes 10 located in the active area, wherein the first electrodes connect to the third conducting lines;

a plurality of second electrodes 11 located in the active area, wherein the second electrodes connect to the first conducting lines or second conducting lines;

and wherein the first conducting lines 14 connect to the third conducting lines 15, the second conducting lines 14 connect to the third conducting lines 15.

Applicants specifically traverse the statement that Hinata discloses first conducting lines connected to the third conducting lines and second conducting lines connected to the third conducting lines as claimed in the present application.

As can be clearly seen in, e.g., Figure 1, third conducting lines 121 connect with first conducting lines 141 in the third conducting area 113 and third conducting lines 122 connect with second conducting lines 142 in third conducting area 113. This is also expressly explained in the specification at, e.g., page 11, lines 20-22 and page 12, lines 3-6.

To the contrary, the lead wiring 14 on the left side of the substrate 2 connect only to the electrodes 11 and the driver IC 7. Similarly, the lead wiring 14 on the right side of the substrate 2 connect only to the electrodes 11 and the driver IC 7. Third conducting lines 15 connect to the electrodes 10 and the driver IC 7, but clearly do not connect to the lead wiring 14 on either the left side or the right side of the substrate. Accordingly, Hinata clearly fails to disclose or suggest an element of both claim 1 and 10.

None of the secondary references relied upon in the Official Action to remedy the

Appl. No. 10/648,336  
Amendment dated: December 21, 2005  
Reply to OA of: August 23, 2005

elements of the presently amended claims not found in Hinata disclose this element of the claims. Endo discloses a flexible printed wiring board, but fails to disclose first conducting lines connected to third conducting lines and second conducting lines connected to third conducting lines as claimed in the present invention. Lu discloses a method for forming a non-photosensitive pixel-defining layer on an OLED panel, but fails to disclose first conducting lines connected to third conducting lines and second conducting lines connected to third conducting lines as claimed in the present invention. Hsieh discloses a method of manufacturing an LCD panel, but fails to disclose first conducting lines connected to third conducting lines and second conducting lines connected to third conducting lines as claimed in the present invention. Ogura discloses a light emitting device, but fails to disclose first conducting lines connected to third conducting lines and second conducting lines connected to third conducting lines as claimed in the present invention. Holland discloses electrical device connections, but fails to disclose first conducting lines connected to third conducting lines and second conducting lines connected to third conducting lines as claimed in the present invention. Kawaguchi discloses a printed circuit board mounted with electrical elements thereon, but fails to disclose first conducting lines connected to third conducting lines and second conducting lines connected to third conducting lines as claimed in the present invention. And finally, Katsumata discloses a head suspension assembly, but fails to disclose first conducting lines connected to third conducting lines and second conducting lines connected to third conducting lines as claimed in the present invention. Therefore, because none of the prior art references cited in the Official Action, either standing alone or in combination, disclose or suggest every element of the presently claimed invention, Applicants respectfully assert that a proper §103(a) rejection according to the guidelines set forth in MPEP §2143 has not been established. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1-4, 6-8, 10-13, 15-16, 18-20 and 22 under §103(a) be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 5 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinata in view of Endo, Lu and Hsieh, the rejection of claims 9 and 21 under 35

Appl. No. 10/648,336

Amendment dated: December 21, 2005

Reply to OA of: August 23, 2005

U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinata in view of Endo, Lu and Ogura, the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinata in view of Endo, Lu and Holland, the rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinata in view of Endo, Lu and Kawaguchi, and the rejection of claims 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinata in view of Endo, Lu and Katsumata have each been carefully considered but are most respectfully traversed in light of the amendments to the claims and the following comments.

As explained in detail above, contrary to the position of the Official Action, Hinata fails to disclose a first conducting wire connected to a third conducting wire and second conducting wire connected to a third conducting wire as recited in independent claims 1 and 10. Also as described above, none of the prior art references cited in the outstanding Official Action remedy this deficiency of Hinata. Therefore, claims 1 and 10 are allowable over all the references of record. Because claims 5, 9, 14, 17, 21 and 23-25 each depend from either claim 1 or 10, all of these claims are also allowable over the references of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103(a) rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/648,336


Amendment dated: December 21, 2005

Reply to OA of: August 23, 2005

In view of the above comments and further amendments to the claims, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims now present in the application are most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

By:   
Scott A. Brairton  
Registration No. 55,020

625 Slaters Lane, 4<sup>th</sup> Fl.  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Phone: (703) 683-0500  
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

SAB:cmd  
A01.wpd

December 22, 2005